MNRAS **000**, 000–000 (2016) Preprint 16 September 2016 Compiled using MNRAS LATEX style file v3.0

The Most Massive Galaxies and Black Holes Allowed by ΛCDM

Peter Behroozi[1],⋆ Joseph Silk[2,3]

[1] *Department of Astronomy, University of California at Berkeley, Berkeley, CA 94720, USA*
[2] *Institut d'Astrophysique, UMR 7095 CNRS, Université Pierre et Marie Curie, 75014 Paris, France*
[3] *Department of Physics and Astronomy, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, MD 21218, USA*

arXiv:1609.04402v1 [astro-ph.GA] 14 Sep 2016

Released 16 September 2016

ABSTRACT

Given a galaxy's stellar mass, its host halo mass has a lower limit from the cosmic baryon fraction and known baryonic physics. At $z > 4$, galaxy stellar mass functions place lower limits on halo number densities that approach expected ΛCDM halo mass functions. High-redshift galaxy stellar mass functions can thus place interesting limits on number densities of massive haloes, which are otherwise very difficult to measure. While halo mass functions at $z < 8$ are consistent with observed galaxy stellar masses, *JWST* and *WFIRST* will more than double the redshift range over which useful constraints are available. We calculate galaxy stellar masses as a function of redshift that, if they existed in sufficient numbers, would either require unusual baryonic physics or in extreme cases would rule out ΛCDM entirely. Extending the calculation to the entire observable Universe, we find that the existence of a single 10^{11} $M_\odot$ galaxy at $z = 13$ would rule out Planck ΛCDM with >95% confidence. Similar arguments apply to black holes; using number density constraints alone, the most massive observed black holes at $z > 5$ must lie above the median $z = 0$ black hole mass — bulge mass relation. If their virial mass estimates are accurate, the quasars SDSS J1044−0125 and SDSS J010013.02+280225.8 must both have black hole mass — stellar mass ratios of at least 2%, equaling the recent $z = 0$ record for central galaxies in NGC 1600.

Key words: early Universe; galaxies: haloes; quasars: supermassive black holes

1 INTRODUCTION

In the framework of Lambda Cold Dark Matter (ΛCDM), galaxies form at the centres of dark matter haloes (see Silk & Mamon 2012; Somerville & Davé 2015, for reviews). The ratio of galaxy stellar mass to halo mass has an absolute maximum from the cosmic baryon fraction ($f_b \sim 0.16$; Planck Collaboration et al. 2015). In practice, stellar feedback processes limit the maximum ratio to $\sim 30\%$ for a Salpeter (1955) initial mass function (Moster et al. 2010, 2013; Behroozi et al. 2010, 2013). At $z < 4$, this maximum ratio is never achieved for massive haloes ($M_h > 10^{12}$ $M_\odot$), due to inefficient cooling (Lu et al. 2011) and feedback from supermassive black holes (Silk & Rees 1998). At $z > 4$, however, comparisons of galaxy and halo number densities suggest that massive haloes can indeed reach close to 30% integrated efficiency in converting baryons into stars (Behroozi et al. 2013; Behroozi & Silk 2015; Finkelstein et al. 2015; Sun & Furlanetto 2016).

Conversely, an observed galaxy mass ($M_\star$) places a lower limit on its host halo mass (M_h). ΛCDM alone implies that $M_h > M_\star/f_b \sim 6.3M_\star$, and known baryonic physics would give a more stringent limit of $M_h > M_\star/(0.3f_b) \sim 21M_\star$. This fact has been used in Steinhardt et al. (2016) to argue that galaxy number densities at $z \sim 5-6$ are inconsistent with ΛCDM. While we disagree with their assumptions (especially that the $M_\star/M_h$ ratio cannot increase at $z > 4$) and therefore also their conclusions, the basic principle that galaxy number densities constrain halo number densities is well-established.

In this paper, we apply the maximum achievable $M_\star/M_h$ ratios to halo mass functions to calculate physically interesting thresholds for observed stellar masses. As galaxy number densities are consistent with halo number densities for redshifts $z < 8$ (Behroozi et al. 2013), we compute galaxy masses that would imply departures from currently-known baryonic physics or from ΛCDM over $8 < z < 20$, observable with future infrared space-based telescopes (e.g., *JWST*, the *James Webb Space Telescope*, and *WFIRST*, the *Wide-Field InfraRed Survey Telescope*).

Similarly, interesting physical thresholds can be calculated for supermassive black holes (SMBHs). Constraints on SMBH mass ($M_\bullet$) at $z = 0$ suggest a maximum $M_\bullet/M_\star$ ratio of 2% for non-satellite galaxies (Thomas et al. 2016); and the highest median relation for the $M_\bullet/M_\star$ ratio at $z = 0$ (Kormendy & Ho 2013) gives $\sim 0.5\%$ for $M_{\rm bulge} = 10^{11}$ $M_\odot$. The observed number density of high-z quasars gives a limit on the largest possible host halo mass in ΛCDM (see also Haiman & Loeb 2001), which in turn limits

⋆ Hubble Fellow; E-mail: behroozi@berkeley.edu

© 2016 The Authors



Figure 1. Top left panel: threshold stellar masses for a cumulative number density of $\Phi = 10^{-6}$ Mpc^{-3}. If a survey found that galaxies with stellar masses larger than the *black* line had a cumulative number density higher than 10^{-6} Mpc^{-3}, it would rule out ΛCDM. Similarly, if galaxies with stellar masses above the *red* line were observed to have a cumulative number density above 10^{-6} Mpc^{-3}, it would likely require rethinking the physics of stellar feedback in galaxies. **Top right** panel: same, for a cumulative number density threshold of $\Phi = 10^{-8}$ Mpc^{-3}. **Bottom left** panel: same, for the entire observable Universe (i.e., all sky survey with $\Delta z = \pm 0.5$). **Bottom right** panel: Cumulative number density thresholds as a function of stellar mass and redshift; observed galaxy cumulative number densities exceeding these thresholds would require unusual baryonic physics to explain.

the highest possible host galaxy mass (via $M_\star < 0.3 f_b M_h$). Hence, given the number density of black holes of a given mass, we can derive a lower limit for their $M_\bullet/M_\star$ ratios without requiring difficult observations of the host galaxy.

Throughout, we assume a flat, ΛCDM cosmology with $\Omega_M = 0.309$, $\Omega_b = 0.0486$, $\sigma_8 = 0.816$, $h = 0.678$, $n_s = 0.967$, corresponding to the best-fit *Planck* cosmology (Planck Collaboration et al. 2015). For halo masses, we use the virial overdensity definition of Bryan & Norman (1998).

2 METHODOLOGY

We adopt cumulative halo mass functions (Φ_h) from Behroozi et al. (2013) and define two maximum cumulative galaxy mass functions, both functions of redshift:

$$\Phi_{\star,\Lambda\mathrm{CDM}}(M_\star, z) \equiv \Phi_h(M_\star/f_b, z) \quad (1)$$

$$\Phi_{\star,\mathrm{feedback}}(M_\star, z) \equiv \Phi_h(M_\star/(0.3 f_b), z) \quad (2)$$

If the observed cumulative number density of galaxies ($\Phi_{\star,\mathrm{obs}}$) exceeds $\Phi_{\star,\Lambda\mathrm{CDM}}$, it rules out our adopted ΛCDM model (provided that the observations are correct). Likewise, if $\Phi_{\star,\mathrm{obs}}$ exceeds $\Phi_{\star,\mathrm{feedback}}$, it could imply either that our understanding of stellar feedback is incorrect or that our adopted ΛCDM model is incorrect. As our understanding of stellar feedback is much less certain, we assume that $\Phi_{\star,\mathrm{obs}}$ exceeding $\Phi_{\star,\mathrm{feedback}}$ but not $\Phi_{\star,\Lambda\mathrm{CDM}}$ most likely implies a deficit in our knowledge of stellar feedback.

Similarly, we define two cumulative supermassive black hole (SMBH) mass functions:

$$\Phi_{\bullet,\mathrm{max}}(M_\bullet, z) \equiv \Phi_h(M_\bullet/(0.02 \cdot 0.3 f_b), z) \quad (3)$$

$$\Phi_{\bullet,\mathrm{median}}(M_\bullet, z) \equiv \Phi_h(M_\bullet/(0.005 \cdot 0.3 f_b), z) \quad (4)$$

If $\Phi_{\bullet,\mathrm{obs}}$ exceeds $\Phi_{\bullet,\mathrm{max}}$, the observed black holes must have $M_\bullet/M_\star$ ratios of >2% (assuming that galaxies do not exhibit new physics), potentially implying that unusual accretion physics grows the SMBH quickly relative to its host galaxy (Volonteri et al. 2015) or that massive seeds had high initial $M_\bullet/M_\star$ ratios (Bromm & Loeb 2003; Banik et al. 2016). If $\Phi_{\bullet,\mathrm{obs}}$ exceeds $\Phi_{\bullet,\mathrm{median}}$, then the SMBHs have $M_\bullet/M_\star$ ratios above the $z = 0$ median relation. Our choice of the highest $z = 0$ median relation makes the latter statement as conservative as possible—i.e., if $M_\bullet/M_\star$ is higher than Kormendy & Ho (2013), then it will also be higher than all other determinations (e.g., Häring & Rix 2004; McConnell & Ma 2013).

3 RESULTS

Similar to CANDELS (Koekemoer et al. 2011; Grogin et al. 2011) with *Hubble*, a future *JWST* survey may probe galaxy cumulative number densities down to $n_J \sim 10^{-6}$ Mpc^{-3}. *WFIRST* has

a $\sim 100\times$ larger field of view, so it may reach cumulative number densities of $n_W \sim 10^{-8}$ Mpc^{-3}. For these two threshold densities, we plot $\Phi^{-1}(n,z)$ (i.e., the stellar mass $M_\star(z)$ at which $\Phi(M_\star(z),z) = n$) for both $\Phi_{\star,\rm feedback}$ and $\Phi_{\star,\Lambda\rm CDM}$ in Fig. 1. For comparison, we also plot observed cumulative number densities for galaxies at $z = 8$ from Song et al. (2016) and $z = 11.1$ from Oesch et al. (2016). Neither observation approaches cumulative number densities of 10^{-8} Mpc^{-3}, but that is not necessary—all galaxies with cumulative number densities greater than this threshold must still have stellar masses less than the values given by $\Phi^{-1}_{\star,\Lambda\rm CDM}$ and $\Phi^{-1}_{\star,\rm feedback}$ to be consistent with ΛCDM and known stellar feedback physics, respectively.[1] For arbitrary future surveys, Fig. 1 also shows cumulative number density thresholds as a function of galaxy stellar mass from $z = 4$ to $z = 20$, including a comparison to the massive galaxy in Stefanon et al. (2015). If this galaxy's reported stellar mass and redshift were correct ($z = 5.4$ and $10^{11.7}$ M$_\odot$ after conversion to a Salpeter 1955 IMF), it would require turning $> 30\%$ of the baryons in its host halo into stars; however, both measurements have significant uncertainties (§4). Finally, we calculate limits using a cumulative number density $n(z)$ such that only one object should exist in a volume $20\times$ greater than the volume of the observable Universe over a redshift range $z-0.5$ to $z+0.5$; these volumes are potentially accessible with all-sky surveys like SPHEREX (Doré et al. 2014). Finding a single galaxy above the black threshold in Fig. 1 (bottom-left panel)—e.g., a 10^{11} M$_\odot$ galaxy at $z = 13$—would rule out the adopted ΛCDM model with 95% confidence in the absence of other priors and observations at other redshifts.

Threshold masses for black holes are shown in Fig. 2 and compared to the most massive known quasars at $z > 5$ (Jiang et al. 2007; Willott et al. 2010; De Rosa et al. 2011; Mortlock et al. 2011; Wu et al. 2015; Wang et al. 2015). As bright quasars are detectable in large-area photometric surveys (e.g., the SDSS, Pâris et al. 2014, and the CFHQS, Willott et al. 2007), we calculate mass thresholds at cumulative number densities of $10^{-9.5}$ Mpc^{-3} and 10^{-11} Mpc^{-3}. Provided their mass estimates are correct, all referenced quasars exceed the highest median $z = 0$ $M_\bullet/M_\star$ ratios (Kormendy & Ho 2013). Two quasars, SDSS J1044−0125 (Jiang et al. 2007) and SDSS J010013.02+280225.8 (Wu et al. 2015) have minimum $M_\bullet/M_\star$ ratios equalling the 2% ratio found for NGC 1600 (Thomas et al. 2016).


Φ > 10^-9.5 Mpc^-3 (CFHQS-like survey)
Planck ΛCDM Ruled Out
Unusual Accretion Physics / Massive Seeds
Above z=0 Median Relation
Willott et al. 2010
De Rosa et al. 2011
Jiang et al. 2007
BH Mass Threshold [M_o]
z
Φ > 10^-11 Mpc^-3 (SDSS-like survey)
Planck ΛCDM Ruled Out
Unusual Accretion Physics / Massive Seeds
Above z=0 Median Relation
Wang et al. 2015
Wu et al. 2015
Mortlock et al. 2011
BH Mass Threshold [M_o]
z

Figure 2. Top panel: threshold black hole masses for a cumulative number density of $\Phi = 10^{-9.5}$ Mpc^{-3}. If a survey found black holes with masses above the *red* line and cumulative number densities above $10^{-9.5}$ Mpc^{-3}, those black holes would exceed the current record $z = 0$ black hole mass—stellar mass ratio. Similarly, if a survey found black holes with masses above the *blue* line and cumulative number densities above $10^{-9.5}$ Mpc^{-3}, those black holes would exceed all current determinations of the median $z = 0$ black hole mass—stellar mass ratio. **Bottom** panel: same, for a cumulative number density threshold of $\Phi = 10^{-11}$ Mpc^{-3}.

4 DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

Aforementioned "other priors" significantly limit any naive attempt to rule out ΛCDM with galaxy masses. First are uncertainties in converting luminosity to stellar mass (Conroy et al. 2009; Behroozi et al. 2010); besides systematic offsets, these also induce Eddington bias (Eddington 1913) that artificially inflates the number densities of massive galaxies (Behroozi et al. 2010; Caputi et al. 2011; Grazian et al. 2015). Also present are uncertainties in photo-z codes and priors; improperly chosen, the latter can similarly inflate massive galaxy counts (Stefanon et al. 2015). Just as problematic are multiple peaks in the posterior distribution of z, as for the massive galaxy in Stefanon et al. (2015). Finally, we note the relatively high lensing optical depth at $z > 8$, which further boosts the apparent number of massive galaxies (Mason et al. 2015).

Black hole masses are also subject to many uncertainties (see Peterson 2014, for a review), and virial masses in particular may be overestimates (Shankar et al. 2016). Selecting the largest black holes from a sample with uncertain masses also imposes Eddington bias. Nonetheless, our limits agree with other approaches that infer large black hole mass — stellar mass ratios (Targett et al. 2012; Venemans et al. 2016), which are expected due to selecting for luminous, massive black holes (Lauer et al. 2007; Volonteri & Stark 2011).

Even so, it is exciting that the highest stellar masses observed in Fig. 1 are so close to the limits expected for ΛCDM. This suggests that high-redshift galaxy surveys will give independent checks on the evolution of the halo mass function at $z > 8$, which is otherwise very difficult to measure. Combined with constraints on primordial non-Gaussianities and dark matter from faint galaxies (Habouzit et al. 2014; Governato et al. 2015), *JWST* and *WFIRST* will place very interesting limits on early Universe cosmology.

For SMBHs, $M_\bullet/M_\star > 2\%$ has been claimed at $z = 0$ (e.g., for NGC 1277; Walsh et al. 2016), but only for satellite galaxies whose

[1] We have modestly extrapolated the Song et al. (2016) SMFs to a cumulative number density of 10^{-7} Mpc^{-3} for the middle panel of Fig. 1, but do not feel comfortable extrapolating further.

masses have likely been reduced by tidal stripping (Barber et al. 2016). Direct observation of the quasar host galaxies, if possible, would likely place them at ratios similar to the highest known at $z > 0$ (Trakhtenbrot et al. 2015). Fig. 2 provides a simple estimate of whether a given $M_\bullet$ requires an anomalously high $M_\bullet/M_\star$ ratio, potentially bolstering the case for follow-up observations.

Finally, we cite examples of "unusual" physics that could be invoked if future observations cross the thresholds outlined here. We refer to ideas beyond usual prescriptions for supernova feedback and AGN (active galactic nuclei) quenching that limit star formation in current cosmological and zoom-in simulations. Specifically, we mention positive feedback from AGN (as a precursor to the negative feedback observed via AGN-driven massive gas outflows; Gaibler et al. 2012; Ishibashi & Fabian 2012; Silk 2013; Wagner et al. 2016, examples of which are beginning to be found (Zinn et al. 2013; Cresci et al. 2015; Salomé et al. 2015), and a significant duty cycle of hyper-Eddington accretion, increasingly invoked to solve SMBH growth problems at high redshift (Jiang et al. 2014; Volonteri et al. 2015; Inayoshi et al. 2016).

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We thank Ryan Trainor for helpful discussions. PB was supported by program number HST-HF2-51353.001-A, provided by NASA through a Hubble Fellowship grant from the Space Telescope Science Institute, which is operated by the Association of Universities for Research in Astronomy, Incorporated, under NASA contract NAS5-26555. JS acknowledges support from ERC Project No. 267117 (DARK) hosted by Pierre et Marie Curie University (UPMC) - Paris 6, France.

REFERENCES

Banik N., Tan J. C., Monaco P., 2016, preprint, (arXiv:1608.04421)
Barber C., Schaye J., Bower R. G., Crain R. A., Schaller M., Theuns T., 2016, MNRAS, 460, 1147
Behroozi P. S., Silk J., 2015, ApJ , 799, 32
Behroozi P. S., Conroy C., Wechsler R. H., 2010, ApJ , 717, 379
Behroozi P. S., Wechsler R. H., Conroy C., 2013, ApJ , 770, 57
Bromm V., Loeb A., 2003, ApJ , 596, 34
Bryan G. L., Norman M. L., 1998, ApJ , 495, 80
Caputi K. I., Cirasuolo M., Dunlop J. S., McLure R. J., Farrah D., Almaini O., 2011, MNRAS, 413, 162
Conroy C., Gunn J. E., White M., 2009, ApJ , 699, 486
Cresci G., et al., 2015, ApJ , 799, 82
De Rosa G., Decarli R., Walter F., Fan X., Jiang L., Kurk J., Pasquali A., Rix H. W., 2011, ApJ , 739, 56
Doré O., et al., 2014, preprint, (arXiv:1412.4872)
Eddington A. S., 1913, MNRAS, 73, 359
Finkelstein S. L., et al., 2015, ApJ , 810, 71
Gaibler V., Khochfar S., Krause M., Silk J., 2012, MNRAS, 425, 438
Governato F., et al., 2015, MNRAS, 448, 792
Grazian A., et al., 2015, A&A , 575, A96
Grogin N. A., et al., 2011, ApJS , 197, 35
Habouzit M., Nishimichi T., Peirani S., Mamon G. A., Silk J., Chevallard J., 2014, MNRAS, 445, L129
Haiman Z., Loeb A., 2001, ApJ , 552, 459
Häring N., Rix H.-W., 2004, ApJL , 604, L89
Inayoshi K., Haiman Z., Ostriker J. P., 2016, MNRAS, 459, 3738
Ishibashi W., Fabian A. C., 2012, MNRAS, 427, 2998
Jiang L., Fan X., Vestergaard M., Kurk J. D., Walter F., Kelly B. C., Strauss M. A., 2007, AJ , 134, 1150
Jiang Y.-F., Stone J. M., Davis S. W., 2014, ApJ , 796, 106
Koekemoer A. M., et al., 2011, ApJS , 197, 36
Kormendy J., Ho L. C., 2013, ARAA , 51, 511
Lauer T. R., Tremaine S., Richstone D., Faber S. M., 2007, ApJ , 670, 249
Lu Y., Kereš D., Katz N., Mo H. J., Fardal M., Weinberg M. D., 2011, MNRAS, 416, 660
Mason C. A., et al., 2015, ApJ , 805, 79
McConnell N. J., Ma C.-P., 2013, ApJ , 764, 184
Mortlock D. J., et al., 2011, Nature , 474, 616
Moster B. P., Somerville R. S., Maulbetsch C., van den Bosch F. C., Macciò A. V., Naab T., Oser L., 2010, ApJ , 710, 903
Moster B. P., Naab T., White S. D. M., 2013, MNRAS, 428, 3121
Oesch P. A., et al., 2016, ApJ , 819, 129
Pâris I., et al., 2014, A&A , 563, A54
Peterson B. M., 2014, Space Sci. Rev., 183, 253
Planck Collaboration et al., 2015, preprint, (arXiv:1502.01589)
Salomé Q., Salomé P., Combes F., 2015, A&A , 574, A34
Salpeter E. E., 1955, ApJ , 121, 161
Shankar F., et al., 2016, MNRAS, 460, 3119
Silk J., 2013, ApJ , 772, 112
Silk J., Mamon G. A., 2012, Research in Astronomy and Astrophysics, 12, 917
Silk J., Rees M. J., 1998, A&A , 331, L1
Somerville R. S., Davé R., 2015, ARAA , 53, 51
Song M., et al., 2016, ApJ , 825, 5
Stefanon M., et al., 2015, ApJ , 803, 11
Steinhardt C. L., Capak P., Masters D., Speagle J. S., 2016, ApJ , 824, 21
Sun G., Furlanetto S. R., 2016, MNRAS, 460, 417
Targett T. A., Dunlop J. S., McLure R. J., 2012, MNRAS, 420, 3621
Thomas J., Ma C.-P., McConnell N. J., Greene J. E., Blakeslee J. P., Janish R., 2016, Nature , 532, 340
Trakhtenbrot B., et al., 2015, Science, 349, 168
Venemans B. P., Walter F., Zschaechner L., Decarli R., De Rosa G., Findlay J. R., McMahon R. G., Sutherland W. J., 2016, ApJ , 816, 37
Volonteri M., Stark D. P., 2011, MNRAS, 417, 2085
Volonteri M., Silk J., Dubus G., 2015, ApJ , 804, 148
Wagner A. Y., Bicknell G. V., Umemura M., Sutherland R. S., Silk J., 2016, Astronomische Nachrichten, 337, 167
Walsh J. L., van den Bosch R. C. E., Gebhardt K., Yıldırım A., Richstone D. O., Gültekin K., Husemann B., 2016, ApJ , 817, 2
Wang F., et al., 2015, ApJL , 807, L9
Willott C. J., et al., 2007, AJ , 134, 2435
Willott C. J., et al., 2010, AJ , 140, 546
Wu X.-B., et al., 2015, Nature , 518, 512
Zinn P.-C., Middelberg E., Norris R. P., Dettmar R.-J., 2013, ApJ , 774, 66